



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,495	09/15/2003	John W. Chamberlain	0112300-768	9203
29159 7590 01/29/2009 BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				
EXAMINER				
PANDYA, SUNT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/29/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@BELLBOYD.COM

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/662,495

**Applicant(s)**

CHAMBERLAIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

SUNIT PANDYA

**Art Unit**

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/3/08

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

This action is in response to amendments filed 11/06/08. The examiner acknowledges that no claims have been amended, added or canceled by the applicant in the instant application, consequently claims 1-25 are currently pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. (US Patent 6,892,182) and further in view of Foodman et al. (US Patent 6,547,131).

Claims 1, 10-12, 21-23: Rowe et al. teaches of a electronic fund transfer kiosk to provide a ticket that is used at a gaming device, wherein the kiosk comprises of a processor configured to communicate with a remote fund repository (col. 8: 1-11, wherein Rowe et al. allows user to insert a credit card/debt card, which needs to communicate with a fund repository in order to accept and provide player with monetary amount, however Rowe et al. at no point needs to communicate with ticket validation network mainly because no ticket is being entered to activate the game machine). Rowe et al. also teaches of a display device to display the info (figure 1), and an input device to allow user to input data. Rowe et al. also teaches of a ticket printer configured

to print a ticket wherein the ticket contains the amount requested by the player (figure 2, cols. 1: 58-65, 2: 48-56, 8: 13-24, wherein Rowe et al. allows players to process the monetary request and allows user to print out a ticket when done playing on the gaming machine, which can be taken to any other gaming machine to player further or to the cashier to collect their winnings) and a housing supporting the said processor, display and the printer.

Claim 2: Rowe et al. teaches of a multi-button keypad as the input device (col. 8: 13-24)

Claim 3: Rowe et al. teaches of a printer, however fails to teach the printer being a thermal printer. In an analogous art, Foodman et al. who claims an electronic funds transfer system for gaming machines, teaches of a thermal printer. It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rowe et al. to implement a thermal printer taught by Foodman et al. to improve print qualities of the tickets printed.

Claim 4: Foodman et al. teaches of a display being a vacuum fluorescent display (col. 5: 64-68).

Claim 5: Rowe et al. teaches that the input device could be a touch screen (col. 8: 15-20).

Claim 7: Rowe et al. teaches of a printer which is capable of printing all game related info (including voucher, coupons and printing receipts is within its capabilities).

Claim 6: Rowe et al. teaches using access media (i.e., ticket, card, etc.) could be used to obtain cash from ATM kiosk. Note that, the ATM access station is considered as a kiosk.

Claim 8: Rowe et al. teaches the network is a wide area network (col. 3: 10-28).

Claim 9: Rowe et al. teaches the identification info being a bar code (figure 2).

Claim 13-16: Rowe et al. teaches a plurality of gaming devices, each gaming device including one of the ticket readers, wherein each of the gaming devices is located proximate or remote to the electronic fund transfer kiosk (provided in casino), and at least two of the gaming devices are different types of gaming devices (cols. 2-3: 48-20).

Claims 17-18: Rowe et al. teaches ticket validation network being local within a gaming establishment (col. 3: 10-20) and an operator interface device that operates with the ticket validation network to verify the ticket (service center, i.e., cashier booths, col. 3: 44-55).

Claim 19: Rowe et al. teaches of a local network for ticket validation, however fails to teach the local network being a fiber-optic network. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement a fiber optics network as the local network to provide, maximum speed for data transfer so that the player's aren't waiting too long for their approvals at the kiosk stations.

Claim 20: Foodman et al. teaches of a credit card reader (col. 3: 55-65)

Claim 24: Combination of Rowe et al and Foodman et al. teach of providing account information if the response is a rejection (cols. 3-4: 65-7, 5: 12-48).

Claim 25: Rowe et al. teaches of transmitting the fund request the internet (col. 3: 20-28).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/6/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments that each of the pending claims recites a kiosk based system or method that enables a player to move money from a remote fund repository via an electronic fund transfer network into a gaming device. The funds are moved from the kiosk to the gaming device via a printed ticket that is approved by a ticket validation system, and the kiosk is connected to and communicates through a electronic fund transfer network without communications through a ticket validation network. The examiner respectfully agrees with the applicant and further more would like to point out that the rejection above clearly illustrates how the reference of Rowe et al. teaches of all of the limitations of the applicant submitted claims. Specifically, Rowe et al. teaches of kiosk based system or method that enables a player to move money from a remote fund repository via an electronic fund transfer network into a gaming device, wherein the player can, upon receiving the funds in the gaming device, player the game, at which point the total fund will get the playing amount deducted from the total amount. When the player decides to conclude playing, the left over amount

(amount reflecting total win and loss during the gaming session) from the total amount is then printed on to at ticket as shown by Rowe et al. in figure 2, which the player can present to a cashier to obtain their award or enter into another game machine to activate and play on. Thus Rowe et al. teaches of a kiosk which is connected to and communicates through a electronic fund transfer network without communications through a ticket validation network.

Further more regarding the applicant's arguments that Rowe et al. does not teach the claim language cited above with reference to independent claims, especially regarding two different network. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Rowe et al. in column 3, clearly teaches of multiple communications means to transfer information from each gaming machine to a central host, or accounting system, or clerk validation system or a cage system, to process accordingly.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIT PANDYA whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SP

/Scott E. Jones/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714